

Serial No.: 10/822,358
Amdt. dated 12 December 2006
Reply to Office Action of 13 July 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
DEC 12 2006

REMARKS

As noted previously, the Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application.

Claims 1-11 and 21-30 are pending in the application and were rejected in the Office Action mailed 13 July 2006 on various statutory grounds, described in further detail below. Previously presented claims 12-20 and 31-53 are canceled by the present amendment. Applicants request reconsideration and further examination of the subject application in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Election/Restrictions

Concerning items 1-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner required a restriction among the claims in the application, stating that the Amendment of 26 April 2006 presented claims directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed. (Claims 1-20 were originally filed in the application, with the Examiner requiring a first restriction in the Office Action mailed 08 September 2005.) In the instant Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 31-48 belonged in one group (Group II) while claims 49-53 (associated with Group III) belonged in another.

By the present amendment, previously presented claims 12-20 and 31-53 are canceled. Applicants note that the subject matter of these claims have been filed in three separate divisional applications based on the subject application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 and/or § 102(e)

I. Claims 1-8, and 21-26

Concerning items 6-7 of the Office Action, claims 1-8, and 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,565,038 to Ashley ("Ashley") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. U.S. 2004/0244837 to Nawata et al. ("Nawata"). Applicants

Serial No.: 10/822,358
Amdt. dated 12 December 2006
Reply to Office Action of 13 July 2006

respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration for the following reasons.

(a) Claimed Systems

Amended claim 1 (representative of the independent claims under rejection) recites the following:

1. A system for delivering a desired mass of gas, comprising:
 - a chamber;
 - a first valve controlling gas flow into the chamber;
 - a second valve controlling gas flow out of the chamber;
 - a pressure transducer providing measurements of pressure within the chamber;
 - a controller connected to the valves and the pressure transducer, wherein the controller is configured and arranged to
 - (i) receive a desired mass flow setpoint from an input device;
 - (ii) close the second valve;
 - (iii) open the first valve;
 - (iv) receive chamber pressure measurements from the pressure transducer;
 - (v) close the first valve when pressure within the chamber reaches a predetermined level;
 - (vi) wait a predetermined waiting period to allow the gas inside the chamber to approach a state of equilibrium;
 - (vii) open the second valve at time = t_0 ;
 - (viii) calculate a value of the total mass delivered as the second valve is open and as a function of temperature and pressure within the chamber; and
 - (ix) close the second valve at time = t^* when the calculated value of total mass delivered equals the desired mass flow setpoint.

[Emphasis added]

The system of claim 1 includes a first (inlet) and a second (outlet) valve and a pressure transducer/sensor that are connected to a chamber and to a controller. The controller is configured and arranged so as to control the operation of the valves so that a precise mass of a gas can be delivered through the second valve. The controller continuously monitors pressure and temperature of the gas within the chamber, calculates the actual mass delivered by the system while the outlet valve is open and delivering gas, thereafter closing the outlet valve at the precise time that a mass

Serial No.: 10/822,358
Amtd. dated 12 December 2006
Reply to Office Action of 13 July 2006

flow set point is reached.

(b) Ashley – U.S. Pat. No. 5,565,038

The Examiner relies on Ashley as the primary reference for the rejection. Ashley is directed to removing accumulated films from processing equipment and teaches a system for the continuous flow of an interhalogen gas acting as an etchant through a chamber. The flow, once turned on, is controlled by a thermal mass flow controller. The flow is allowed to run for many seconds. *See* Ashley, e.g., col. 9, lines 8-9. The flow is turned off after the removal (etching) of the accumulated film(s) is complete, as noted by the downstream gas composition detector (12). The process of Ashley is not a quick on/off cycling system, in contrast with the Applicants' claimed systems and methods, e.g., of claim 1. The systems and methods of Ashley require enough time so that the interhalogen gases used can travel to and etch away the accumulated films. Further, the systems and methods of Ashley operate on a time scale that is greater than that of the claimed systems and methods by orders of magnitude. This is verified by Ashley, e.g., in describing the preferred embodiment as occurring over a period of minutes. *See, e.g.*, Ashley, col. 9, lines 8-9 and 45-47. Consequently, a thermal mass flow controller as taught by Ashley is not capable of measuring a short burst of flow from a quick on/off cycle of a valve.

(c) Nawata – U.S. Pat. Pub. No. U.S. 2004/0244837

Nawata is cited as the secondary reference for the rejection. Nawata teaches a pulse shot regulator and pulse shot regulating method. The system and method of Nawata utilize an inlet valve, a volume, an outlet valve, pressure measurement, temperature measurement, and an overall controller. As the Examiner noted, Nawata also teaches use of equations of state to determine flow from a known volume. The system and method of Nawata, however, measure the volume flow Q of gas exhausted from a cutoff valve based on a difference in pressures within a delivery chamber after the inlet valve is closed, and again after the outlet valve is closed, i.e., at the beginning and end of the delivery process. *See* Nawata, paragraph [0060]. Measurements are made only after a particular gas flow delivery process (or pulse shot) has been completed. *See* Nawata, paragraph [0061]. If the

Serial No.: 10/822,358
Amdt. dated 12 December 2006
Reply to Office Action of 13 July 2006

mass in the gas flow delivered by the Nawata system is insufficient for required purposes, the only recourse is to correct the error by a subsequent delivery process (pulse shot) as the Nawata system does not measure actual mass delivered by the system.

(d) Prima Facie Case of Obviousness not established

For a rejection under the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the cited reference(s) must teach or suggest each and every of the limitation in the claim(s) at issue. A further requirement for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is that proper motivation must exist to modify the cited reference(s) in the proposed manner. In this situation, the combination of Ashley and Nawata fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation in claims 1-8, and 21-26 as amended; further, there is no motivation to modify the teachings of the references in the way proposed by the Examiner. Thus, a *prima facie* case of obviousness for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has not been established.

For the rejection, the Examiner characterized Ashley as teaching a controller that is configured and arranged to, among other things, (i) receive a desired mass flow set point; (ii) open the second valve at a first time; (iii) calculate a value of the total mass delivered as the second valve is open and a function of temperature and pressure with the chamber; and (iv) close the second valve second valve at a time subsequent to the first when the calculated value of the total mass delivered equals the desired mass flow set point. Applicants respectfully traverse this characterization of Ashley as there is no description or suggestion in Ashley of a controller that is configured and arranged to “(viii) calculate a value of the total mass delivered as the second valve is open and as a function of temperature and pressure within the chamber; and (ix) close the second valve at time = t* when the calculated value of total mass delivered equals the desired mass flow setpoint.” e.g., as claimed in Applicants' claim 1. To the contrary, the computer taught by Ashley begins an overetch timer and then begins a ramp down process to reduce flow rate from a mass flow controller only after the concentration detector (12) has sent a signal corresponding to a predetermined level of product gas downstream of the chamber. See Ashley, Fig. 1 and col. 9, lines 32-40. Thus, the computer of Ashley does not calculate mass being delivered from the system and close a second valve based on

Serial No.: 10/822,358
Amdt. dated 12 December 2006
Reply to Office Action of 13 July 2006

the calculated amount of mass, contrary to claims 1 and 21 of the subject application. Moreover, the secondary reference, Nawata, fails to cure the deficiencies noted for Ashley.

As described previously, Nawata teaches measurements are made only after a particular gas flow delivery process (or pulse shot) has been completed. See, e.g., Nawata, paragraph [0061]. The Applicants' claimed systems operate in a fundamentally different manner than the system of Nawata by measuring the mass of gas as it is delivered from the chamber through the outlet valve, with the controller closing the outlet valve at the time the controller determines that the desired amount of mass of gas is delivered. The Applicants' systems consequently automatically compensate for varying charge pressures, downstream pressures (which affect flow out of the delivery chamber), and orifice geometries and timing characteristics of the inlet and outlet valves, while still delivering a desired quantity of gaseous mass.

Not only does the combination of Ashley and Nawata not teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 21, as described above, but proper motivation does not exist to modify the references in the way suggested by the Examiner. In making the rejection, the Examiner stated that one of skill in the art would find it obvious to optimize the operation of Ashley's as taught by Nawata. Applicants traverse this statement and respectfully submit that the Examiner may have employed impermissible hindsight analysis for the rejection, as one of skill in the art would understand both Ashley and Nawata as teaching away from claims 1 and 21 (from which the remaining claims under rejection depend).

As noted previously, the operation of the systems and methods of Ashley are based on a mass flow controller permitting flow of an interhalogen gas through the system to etch away films accumulated during normal operation of the system. Ashley teaches that the mass flow controller is (i) kept open long enough for the interhalogen gas(es) to remove the targeted films, and (ii) caused to close automatically, upon receiving a signal from a downstream concentration sensor. Thus, Ashley teaches away from a controller that calculates the amount of mass leaving the system as the second valve is open and that closes the second valve when the calculated mass amount reaches a desired set

Serial No.: 10/822,358
Amdt. dated 12 December 2006
Reply to Office Action of 13 July 2006

point, as recited in independent claims 1 and 21.

The Nawata reference also teaches away from the systems of claims 1 and 21 by teaching that all mass calculations for mass delivery by "pulse shots" are performed only after the second cutoff valve has closed and after the mass from the "gas filling capacity" has exited (been exhausted from) the Nawata system. Thus, one of skill in the art would not find any motivation to utilize a controller as claimed in claims 1 and 21 of the subject application.

Because of the foregoing reasons, the combination of Ashley and Nawata is an improper basis for a rejection of claims 1-8, and 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and the rejection of claims 1-8, and 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be removed accordingly.

II. Claims 1-10, 21-26, and 30

Concerning item 8 of the Office Action, claims 1-10, 21-26, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Nawata. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration for the following reasons.

For the rejection, when referring to claim 1, the Examiner contends that Nawata teaches a controller that is programmed to, among other things "open the second valve at time $t=t_0$; and close the second valve at time t^* when the mass of gas ("from process gas source"; Figure 1) discharged equals the desired mass." Applicants respectfully submit that this characterization of Nawata does not meet all of the limitations of claim 1 (set forth above) and/or claim 21. While correctly noting that "Nawata is not specific in teaching the operation of his valves with respect to the computer logic and processing claimed in claims 1-8, and 21-29," the Examiner buttressed the rejection by stating "In the event that Nawata is not deemed to anticipate Applicant's claimed inventions, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the operation of the claimed apparatus."

Serial No.: 10/822,358
Amdt. dated 12 December 2006
Reply to Office Action of 13 July 2006

As stated previously, Nawata does not teach or suggest a controller that is configured and arranged as recited in independent claims 1 and 21, and therefore does not anticipate independent claims 1 and 21 or for that matter any claims dependent upon claims 1 and 21. Further, as stated previously, Nawata actually fails to suggest and indeed teaches away from the elements of claims 1 and 21, including "(vii) open the second valve at time = t₀; (viii) calculate a value of the total mass delivered as the second valve is open and as a function of temperature and pressure within the chamber; and (ix) close the second valve at time = t* when the calculated value of total mass delivered equals the desired mass flow setpoint" as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claim 21.

Thus, Nawata is an improper basis for a rejection of claims 1-10, 21-26, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)/§103(a), and these claims are patentable over Nawata. The rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)/§103(a) should be withdrawn accordingly and the claims allowed.

III. Claims 11, and 27-29

Concerning item 9 of the Office Action, claims 11, and 27-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawata in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,193,212 to Ohmi et al. ("Ohmi"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration for the following reasons.

The deficiencies of Nawata relative to claims 1 and 21 (from which claims 11 and 27-29 depend, respectively) are described above. For the rejection, the Examiner correctly noted that Nawata fails to teach or suggest that the second valve has a response time of about 1 to 5 milliseconds, and then cited Ohmi to remedy the deficiency of Nawata. Ohmi describes a fluid control valve and fluid supply/exhaust system. The control valve is described as having a response time in the order of several milliseconds, as cited by the Examiner. One embodiment of Ohmi is described as including fluid supply and exhaust system is illustrated in Fig. 3 and described in column 14 of the patent. As described "the system comprises a gas source, flow rate regulator, and a valve, together with devices into which fluid flow from this system." (See col. 14, lines 6-10) The

Serial No.: 10/822,358
Amndt. dated 12 December 2006
Reply to Office Action of 13 July 2006

operation of the system is then described. Ohmi does not teach or suggest, at least, the controller as claimed in claims 1 and 21 of the subject application. Thus, Ohmi does not cure the deficiencies noted previously for Nawata.

Consequently, the combination of Nawata and Ohmi fails to teach all of the limitations of independent claims 1 and 21, which are therefore patentable over these cited references. As claims 11, and 27-29 depend from claims 1 and 21, respectively, they are patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 21. Thus, the rejection of claim 11, and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is without proper basis and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks submitted herein, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims in the subject application are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for the application. If a telephone conference will expedite prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our deposit account, No. 50-1133, for the fees corresponding to a Petition for Extension of Time (two-months) under 37 CFR § 1.136 and a Request for Continued Examination under 37 CFR. § 1.114, and for any fees required for the prosecution of the subject application.

Respectfully submitted,
McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Date: 12 December 2006


Toby H. Kusmer, P.C., Reg. No. 26,418
G. Matthew McCloskey, Reg. No. 47,025
Attorneys for Applicants
28 State Street
Boston, MA 02109-1775
Telephone: (617) 535-4000
Facsimile: (617) 535-3800